

**Drawings**

Applicants have not received a Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, Form PTO-948, indicating whether the formal drawings have been approved by the Official Draftsperson. It is respectfully submitted that the drawings comply with the requirements of the USPTO. Clarification with the next official communication is respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 7, 8-11, 13-16, and 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,345,102 to Davis et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,396,197 to Szilagyi et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that the combinations of elements set forth in the independent claims are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Davis et al., taken alone or in combination with Szilagyi et al.

In contrast to the Applicants' claimed invention, Davis et al. merely shows a vehicle sun visor attachment including loudspeaker attachment 24, rectangular panel 26, piezoelectric elements 28, wires 30, and fixing material 32, as shown in FIG. 2. Davis et al. does not teach or suggest a piezoelectric film covering an opening formed in a frame and a laminating film attached to one side of the frame and covering the piezoelectric film, as recited in claims 17 and 18.

On page 2 of the Office Action, it is suggested that it would have been obvious to entirely cover the back of the frame 26 with the laminating film or fixed material 32 in order

to securely hold the speaker to the sun visor 10 of Davis et al. Applicants respectfully disagree. Since the Davis et al. speaker is already secured to the sun visor 10 without the fixing material having to cover the frame, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to increase the area of the fixing material of Davis et al.

Furthermore, Davis et al. does not teach or suggest a speaker having a peripheral edge supported by a frame having a center opening, as recited in claim 19, since the rectangular panel 26 of Davis et al. does not support an edge of any of the piezoelectric elements 28. The piezoelectric elements 28 in Davis et al. are placed directly on the rectangular panel 26 in such a manner that one entire side of each piezoelectric element 28 is covered by the rectangular panel 26. By contrast, the piezoelectric film in the present invention is not placed on any structure in such a manner that one entire side of the piezoelectric film is covered by that structure.

The Office Action relies on Szilagyi et al. for a teaching of the detachable fastener fastening a piezoelectric speaker to a surface of a helmet. However, Szilagyi et al. fails to teach or suggest the above-cited limitations of claims 17-19 and, therefore, fails to cure the deficiencies of Davis et al. as a primary reference.

In rejecting claim 9, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggests that Szilagyi et al. teaches as being inherent a curvature of a frame having a radius in the range of 210-360 mm. Again, Applicants respectfully disagree. Nowhere does Szilagyi et al. teach such a limitation, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide a reference teaching this limitation.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Davis et al. and Szilagyi et al. is improper, because Davis et al. is directed to a loudspeaker for a vehicle sun visor, whereas Szilagyi et al. discloses a piezoelectric speaker for use in a device such as a computer keyboard or bicycle helmet. One skilled in the art would not find motivation to combine references directed to such disparate devices.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the final rejections of claims 17-19 as being unpatentable over Davis et al. in view of Szilagyi et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 17-19 are in condition for allowance. Since the dependent claims depend directly or indirectly from allowable independent claims 17-19, they are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional limitations provided by these claims. Therefore, all claims should be in condition for allowance, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

#### **CONCLUSION**


All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objection and rejection and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

However, if there are any outstanding issues, the Examiner is invited to telephone Sam Bhattacharya, Reg. No. 48,107, at 703-205-8000 in an effort to expedite prosecution.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants hereby request a one-month extension of time in which to file this reply. A check for the required fee of \$110 is attached.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
James T. Eller, Jr.  
Reg. No. 39,538

505-673P

JTE:SB:rk  
SB

P. O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000